

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**MOHAMED A. METWALI, HUSSEIN MAHROUS
NAYEL BASSAM, SAYEGH,**

Plaintiffs,

- against -

**APV VALET PARKING CORP. d/b/a
APV VALET PARKING CORP.,
and ALBERT VUKUDEDAJ,**

Defendants.

RONALD L. ELLIS, United States Magistrate Judge:

On April 1, 2016, Plaintiffs Mohamed A. Metwali, Hussein Zakaria H. Mahrous, and Nayel Bassam Sayegh initiated this action by filing a Complaint. (Doc. No. 1.) The Honorable Colleen McMahon referred this action to the undersigned for discovery disputes on October 12, 2016. (Doc. No.14.) On February 13, 2017, the Parties consented to the jurisdiction of the undersigned. (Doc. No. 29.)

On April 4, 2017, the Parties appeared before the Court for a settlement conference on April 4, 2017. The Parties informed the Court that they had reached a settlement-in-principle on July 16, 2017. (Doc. No. 40.) On July 24, 2017, counsel for Plaintiff filed a letter asking the Court to approve the Parties' settlement agreement along with the executed settlement agreement. (Doc. No. 41.) Because the document was flagged for a filing error, the Court contacted the Parties and directed them to properly re-file the settlement agreement. The re-filed settlement agreement without the signatures or letter in support was filed on July 27, 2017. (Doc. No. 42.)

**USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 10-10-17**

**OPINION AND ORDER
16-CV-2440 (RLE)**


Pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, if the settlement is to take effect, the Court must first review and scrutinize the agreement to ensure that it is fair. *See Cheeks v. Freeport Pancake House, Inc.*, 793 F.3d 199 (2d Cir. 2015); *see also Wolinsky v. Scholastic Inc.*, No. 11 Civ. 5917, 2012 WL 2700381 (S.D.N.Y. July 5, 2012).

On September 13, 2017, the Court ordered the Parties to refile the settlement, curing the defects outlined in the opinion. (Doc. No. 43.) The Plaintiffs refiled the settlement agreement on September 29, 2017. (Doc. No. 44.)

The Court has reviewed the submissions from counsel in support of the proposed settlement of this action. (Doc. Nos. 41, 42, and 44.) Based on the written submissions and discussions with the Parties during settlement negotiations, the Court finds that the proposed agreement is fair and reasonable. *See Cheeks*, 796 F.3d 199. Accordingly, the settlement is **APPROVED**.

The Clerk of Court is directed to terminate this action with prejudice.

SO ORDERED this 10th day of October 2017.
New York, New York


The Honorable Ronald L. Ellis
United States Magistrate Judge